

**SUMMARIZED MINUTES
SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Regular Meeting**



**THURSDAY, MAY 18, 2006
CITY HALL KIVA
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

PRESENT: Mark Gilliland, Chair
William Howard, Commissioner
Matthew Taunton, Commissioner
J. David Hill, Commissioner

ABSENT: Kelly McCall, Commissioner
Brian Davis, Vice-Chair

STAFF: Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director
Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation Planner
Debra Astin, Transit Manager

OTHERS: Paul Basha, Morrison Maierle
Steve Bass, Asylum Pipeline Marketing Group
Charlie Hales, HDR
Michael Kelly
Dave McDonald

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Gilliland at 6:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed Commissioners present as stated above.

1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Study Session of the Transportation Commission - April 20, 2006

Regular Meeting of the Transportation Commission - April 20, 2006

Chairman Gilliland noted that Commissioner McCall, who is unable to attend tonight's meeting, forwarded a comment, which has been incorporated into the minutes.

COMMISSIONER HOWARD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING AND STUDY SESSION OF APRIL 20, 2006. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER TAUNTON AND CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO ZERO (0).

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

3. **TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE**

Principal Transportation Planner Teresa Huish presented an update on the progress of the Transportation Master Plan. She briefly outlined the informational presentation staff made to City Council at a Study Session on May 9th.

Reviewing the public meetings staff have attended, Ms. Huish presented a summary of public input and the issues that have surfaced in this process.

Mr. Charlie Hales of HDR Engineering addressed the meeting regarding the draft technical criteria, explaining that this is an aspirational plan. In evaluating plan options, they have taken into consideration input from the Commission, City Council, citizens including the community working group.

Highlights of Mr. Hales' presentation included a discussion regarding the measurement of access to transit; the impact of regional travel through Scottsdale; safety and disaster concerns; automobile access and convenience; pedestrian access and convenience; universal (ADA) access; bicycle access and convenience; equestrian access; transit access and utilization; downtown access; sustainability issues; noise concerns; and neighborhood preservation.

He noted that the team plans to consult with the Police and Fire Departments regarding emergency vehicles' response issues. Mr. Hales added that they have already discussed cost-benefit analysis with the Commission, both true life-cycle cost and leveraging funds for capital and operating costs.

Commissioner Taunton asked whether individual projects within the Transportation Master Plan will be brought back to the Commission on an individual basis, or whether all projects will be bundled together when the Transportation Master Plan comes before the Commission.

Transportation Planning and Transit Director Mr. Dave Meinhart replied that one of the reasons staff have identified some area studies is that they are aware of potentially contentious issues. It is too early to predict how these will be brought before the Commission. He assured Commissioner Taunton that the process has the flexibility to handle these issues.

Commissioner Howard remarked that he is interested in re-evaluating the general mobility plan to ascertain whether it is valid in the light of the plan goals.

Mr. Hales replied that City staff has directed his firm to be vigilant in looking for any policies that may need to be changed. So far he sees nothing in the mobility element of the General Plan that is in conflict with the criteria.

Chairman Gilliland asked whether there has been any discussion of a general noise ordinance in the public meetings. Mr. Meinhart replied that people have expressed a generalized concern regarding roadway noise, but nothing more specific as yet.

Chairman Gilliland asked what City Council's response to the presentation on high capacity transit had been. Ms. Huish replied that staff had provided City Council with a brief history of the studies done over the past ten years; Council input primarily addressed the need for regional coordination.

Chairman Gilliland asked whether City Council had any additional input regarding the need for an additional north-south route in north Scottsdale. Mr. Meinhart replied that they did not, but in follow-up discussions at workshops, the public are expressing interest in a north-south route roughly following the Hayden Road alignment, at least as far north as Dynamite.

Chairman Gilliland remarked that the Commissioners are looking for a way to prioritize the different aspects of the Transportation Master Plan. He is interested in a cost-benefit analysis of technologies such as ITS, transit types, and projects.

In response to a question from Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Meinhart noted that staff is coordinating a joint meeting with the Planning Commission for June or July.

Commissioner Hill asked Ms. Huish and Mr. Hales whether they had perceived active interest and a desire to coordinate and work with the other entities at the interjurisdictional meetings they attended. Mr. Hales replied that the other bodies appreciated that Scottsdale was reaching out and that the Transportation Commission wants to coordinate with them. Mr. Meinhart added that project coordination is already underway, citing projects with the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community, Phoenix, and Tempe.

Commissioner Hill asked whether any of the other entities have invited Scottsdale to engage in dialog about their own master plans. Mr. Meinhart replied that in his past experience Phoenix has not invited participation in the master plan, although on a project-by-project basis they have collaborated. Currently staff is working with Phoenix, Cave Creek, Carefree and Maricopa Department of Transportation on a corridor study for the Carefree Highway. He noted there are many upcoming projects where it is important for Scottsdale to be involved. They have built positive relations while working with Phoenix on the Scottsdale Road corridor and he looks forward to future cooperation.

Commissioner Howard asked about working with the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community. What do they want from Scottsdale and what effect will that have on the City's future transportation network?

Mr. Meinhart replied that the two areas of focus at this point are coordinating Pima Road and determining how to make that corridor work. The Indian Community has asked the City to give consideration to a prior decision made by Council to abandon connections from 96th Street into the Community. This will be looked at in the process of working on the Transportation Master Plan, although Mr. Meinhart noted that the City must take into account the neighborhood expectations.

4. **DOWNTOWN TROLLEY**

Mr. Meinhart reported that staff is delaying changes to the downtown trolley route because of construction delays to the Marshall Way bridge. Everyone who attended the February public meeting has been notified to that effect.

Mr. Meinhart introduced Mr. Steve Bass of the Asylum Pipeline Marketing Group who are developing a marketing program for the City's family of trolley services.

Mr. Bass gave a presentation on the progress to date. Highlights of his presentation included an overview of the process and the scope of the insight collection. He spoke of observations their research has uncovered.

Commissioner Hill asked whether marketing to the schoolchildren is taking place. Mr. Bass replied that at the present time he is not aware of that. Mr. Meinhart added that the planned Neighborhood Connection into southeastern Scottsdale will pass Hohokam Elementary School and staff realize that children may be able to use the service. Commissioner Hill commented that this would be training for the next generation. He opined that letting visitors know about the transit services before they arrive in Scottsdale is very important for the business and tourism community. He is a staunch advocate of the circulator service.

Commissioner Taunton noted there is a difference in perspective between visitors who ride the trolleys for fun versus residents who need to get around in their daily lives. However, everyone needs a user-friendly system with easy maps and schedules. In his opinion the use of the trolley implies a tourist theme. If the circulator service is expanded in the future, maybe a different type of vehicle could be used.

Commissioner Howard thanked Mr. Bass for a very insightful and interesting report. Mr. Bass advised the Commission that his group would be putting together a strategy that will be presented to the Commission in July or August.

In reply to a further comment by Commissioner Howard, Mr. Bass confirmed that the data collection was mostly done in March. Commissioner Howard remarked it would be interesting to see whether there are seasonal variations. It might be that the summer and winter riderships are complementary. Mr. Bass replied this was a great point. The firm will use the survey instrument at a later time to monitor trends and make comparisons.

5. NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Traffic Engineering Director Mr. Paul Porell reported that there is an update for the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program Policies and Procedures Manual.

He noted that staff is moving forward with training associated with neighborhood traffic management. On May 23, Scottsdale is sponsoring a professional development seminar, "Traffic Calming for Power Users" at which City staff and other Arizona agencies will learn the appropriate techniques to implement neighborhood traffic management.

Mr. Paul Basha of Morrison Maierle addressed the meeting. He noted that the Policies and Procedures Manual is a very strong document that has evolved through a process of consultation and discussion. He reviewed some of the changes that have occurred in the document as a result of directives from the Commission two months ago.

An eighth goal has been added regarding timely response from the Transportation Department. A fifth objective has been included that clearly identifies the Transportation Commission as a resource to both the Department and citizens.

In the section on process, a sentence has been included specifically addressing temporary measures, with a time frame. The sentence related to adjacent development projects has been clarified. With the initiation of a neighborhood traffic calming process, item 4 with specific volume and speed criteria has been added. This is intended to ascertain whether there might be a traffic volume and speed issue on

a particular street. If this first simple test is passed a number of other travel speed and traffic volume measurements would be performed.

Item 5 identifies two different areas of neighborhood traffic management concern. The new recommendation is that there be two different areas: an affected area and a notification area, with different purposes.

Mr. Basha outlined two different processes for neighborhood traffic management. The first is using meetings only; the second includes a petition process. The Transportation Department's goal is to make the process as free from bureaucracy and as firm as possible, hence the two process options. It is suggested that for a petition to succeed, at least 70 percent of residents should be in agreement.

The manual now includes a lengthy discussion of the various types of traffic calming devices. Mr. Basha stated that the percentage of traffic that must exceed the higher travel speeds has been increased as a result of discussions at a recent Commission meeting. It is now suggested that a working committee be an option for use as part of the process.

Mr. Basha presented two versions of the initial petition form. He recommended using the version where residents sign if they are in support of traffic calming and do not sign if they are not in support. He recommended against using the version where residents can check support or opposition or no opinion to the question. Giving people a choice of "no opinion" could create difficulties trying to determine the percentage of residents in favor or in opposition to traffic calming devices on their street.

Stressing that he was presenting hypothetical examples, Mr. Basha continued discussing the question of affected areas and notification areas. He demonstrated how to determine the affected area and the area that should receive notification. After discussing three different hypothetical situations, Mr. Basha strongly recommended there should not be hard and strict rules for these areas. Judgment will always come into play.

At the invitation of Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Dave McDonald of 10888 North 70th Street, Apartment 266, addressed the meeting, saying that Mr. Basha's presentation was wonderful. Mr. McDonald has a professional background in traffic calming and showed a copy of a booklet he had authored in Washington State, "On the Street Where You Live: Neighborhood Traffic and What We Together Can Do About It," which gave locations of various devices. He suggested that someone could produce a Scottsdale version in electronic form.

Chairman Gilliland asked Mr. Porell whether staff is recommending the adoption of the current version of the draft plan. Mr. Porell replied that staff have been working closely with Mr. Basha to address the comments of the Commission and focus groups.

Chairman Gilliland asked whether staff have any intention to roll the manual out to the public. Mr. Porell replied that staff feels that once they make a decision on the goals, objectives and processes, they would roll it into the Transportation Master Plan. The web page would be revised and the revised goals, objectives, and processes would be published so they would be readily available to citizens.

Commissioner Taunton asked what kind of signage would be used to alert residents to neighborhood meetings. Mr. Porell described the signs used for the Pima Acres project, which had received positive feedback.

Commissioner Taunton recommended that on the page that lists the advantages and disadvantages of traffic calming, the part about possible increases in emergency response time should be reworded, because this could be confusing. Mr. Porell explained that a possible increase in emergency response

time is a known disadvantage to traffic calming. A discussion ensued. Mr. Porell stated that Transportation Department staff work closely with the Police and Fire Departments to identify primary response routes.

Mr. Basha added that the purpose of having the list is to encourage people to recognize there are several factors to be taken into consideration. Members of the public are encouraged to contact Transportation Department staff for further dialogue.

Chairman Gilliland commented that if Commissioner Taunton found this page confusing, doubtless others would also. As a compromise, he suggested changing the heading or adding an introductory paragraph.

Commissioner Hill agreed that having a "no opinion" box people could check in the alternative initial petition would muddy the issue. He asked whether the threshold was 70 percent of the affected area. Mr. Basha confirmed this is the case. Commissioner Hill remarked this is a good percentage. He would recommend acceptance of the improved procedure; however as the entire Commission is not present, he did not think that action should be taken tonight.

Commissioner Howard commented this is a good concept. He asked Mr. Basha for details about the presentation of the hypothetical cases he had presented. He then asked Mr. Basha how he would define the affected area and the notified area in the Mountain View case. Mr. Basha identified the hypothetical case that most closely resembled the Mountain View case. Commissioner Howard noted he is concerned that residents who have no other egress from their neighborhood would be considered to be unaffected.

Mr. Basha told the Commission that a lot was learned from the Mountain View experience. One of the points in the process is the question of direct residential frontage. Mountain View functions as a collector for hundreds of homes, yet is not a residential street. Commissioner Howard pointed out that in the Pima Acres situation there are homes right on that street.

Mr. Porell advised that in Pima Acres, the affected area and the notified area were, in fact, identical. Commissioner Howard replied he wanted to uncover what is an affected area and what is a notified area. He felt there is a potential for imbalance in involvement. Mr. Basha acknowledged Commissioner Howard's concern but noted that there is still notification to the entire area and still a public meeting process. The intent of the petition process is only to ensure there are enough people interested to justify discussion.

Commissioner Howard asked Mr. Basha if he would consider that a meeting that takes place post-petition is similar to the meeting in which residents express their concerns. Mr. Basha said he would. Commissioner Howard suggested they should think about a parallel way of expressing that, so that it is clear that both communities have involvement in the process. Leaving out a group of people is what leads to trouble. Mr. Basha indicated that in the petition process, steps 13 and 14 clearly indicate there is notification both by mail and signage to the entire notification area. Step 15 on the meeting process and the petition process are identical.

Commissioner Howard remarked he would read through the document more thoroughly. He noted that only four of the seven Commissioners are in attendance and the Commission probably ought to request comments from the public at a later meeting before voting.

Chairman Gilliland agreed that Commissioner Howard's point about the definition of the affected area is worthy of consideration. A discussion ensued about the Pima Acres case. He asked Mr. Porell how residents with no other access to their homes are included in the affected area. Chairman Gilliland pointed out that the policy does not state these residents have to be included in the affected area.

Mr. Basha confirmed that Chairman Gilliland's reading is correct. Chairman Gilliland suggested that perhaps this should be added to clarify.

Mr. Basha summarized that the only difference between the petition process and the meeting process is one meeting. There are three meetings with the meeting process and there are two meetings with the petition process. The purpose of the petition process is to offer a written procedure for residents to ask the City to become involved in their neighborhood. There is intentionally no discussion of voting.

Chairman Gilliland asked whether the petition process decides whether traffic calming will be implemented or not. Mr. Porell replied that it in fact does not. Chairman Gilliland asked Mr. Porell to explain the process to the Commission.

Mr. Porell replied that the petition process is basically the process to initiate a discussion on neighborhood traffic management. Chairman Gilliland asked where the check and balance is in the process. Mr. Basha replied that the decision is made in a meeting, not by the petitioners. The decision is made in steps 19 through 23, long after the petition has been submitted. The petition is merely notification by residents to the City to begin a discussion on traffic calming. The decisions are made collectively in the meetings and there is no vote. It is a consensus decision-making process. In response to a follow-up question by Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Basha confirmed the decision is taken at step 22 (d) of the process.

Commissioner Howard commented that in light of this, his concern is alleviated. He assured staff that he is very enthusiastic about the new process, but is trying to understand all the details in the light of past experience.

Chairman Gilliland read comments submitted by Commissioner McCall. "I think we should call this a neighborhood traffic management program or a traffic calming program. The two terms are used interchangeably and may have different interpretations."

In reply to an inquiry by Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Basha confirmed they are using the terms interchangeably, but admitted this is not appropriate. The Neighborhood Traffic Management program is intended to be general and the Traffic Calming program is intended to be specific. Mr. Porell noted that on page 2, three distinct programs are outlined: neighborhood speed awareness program, neighborhood speed hump program, neighborhood traffic calming program. The three programs together make up a Neighborhood Traffic Management program.

Chairman Gilliland noted that Commissioner McCall is asking about the monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of the improvements and any associated follow-up. Mr. Porell suggested adding that as step 24 at the end of the process. Chairman Gilliland agreed this is a very important comment. Mr. Porell suggested they would want to keep this flexible.

Chairman Gilliland read Commissioner McCall's comments that there is "No mention of traffic calming, in particular speed humps, being paid for by citizens. Was this done on purpose?" Chairman Gilliland asked staff whether the speed humps are offered through the neighborhood speed hump program, which is not really the intent of the Neighborhood Traffic Calming program. Mr. Porell confirmed this is correct.

Commissioner Howard noted that some cities insist on the neighborhood paying a portion of the costs of the project. Mr. Porell said that the Scottsdale speed hump program is offered to minor streets where the residents have to pay the cost.

Commissioner McCall wrote: "What has been done to improve our process of identifying affected areas?" Chairman Gilliland noted that the examples staff had presented tonight went a long way towards helping to define that. He suggested attaching the hypothetical examples to the document for reference to show the intent of the original definition. The written definition leaves a lot to the imagination. Mr. Basha requested that the Scottsdale street names not be shown on published examples.

Chairman Gilliland stated that Commissioner McCall was in favor of the alternate initial petition, noting that in her opinion it would make it better for the person collecting signatures.

Commissioner McCall's final comment was "This was the first time I saw the traffic calming device buttons. I'd like to see a definition/discussion of that." Mr. Basha replied that the buttons appear on the example of traffic calming devices. They are simply a different type of speed hump that causes noise and vibration instead of an up and down motion.

Chairman Gilliland concurred with the other Commissioners that there is a lot of information to digest and only four Commissioners in attendance. He suggested that the Commissioners should read through the process once again. He added that staff has made great progress. He hoped that the Commission would be able to take formal action on it in the very near future.

Mr. Basha noted that Mr. McDonald's suggestion of providing examples has considerable merit and could easily be added to the City website. At the invitation of Chairman Gilliland, Mr. McDonald addressed the meeting. He noted that under the advantages of traffic calming nothing appears about neighborhood livability, active street life, or crime prevention. There are many advantages to traffic calming. He recommended that extra advantages be added to the list. Chairman Gilliland remarked that this page has attracted much attention. Maybe there should be a list of general discussion items or considerations, rather than labeling them as advantages or disadvantages.

6. APPROVAL OF CHANGES TO BYLAWS AND ORDINANCE

Mr. Meinhart addressed the Commission. Following discussion at the retreat and previous meetings, the Commission has the opportunity to adopt changes to the bylaws and make recommendations to forward to City Council regarding modification of the Ordinance. Mr. Meinhart outlined the proposed changes to the bylaws.

At the invitation of Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Michael Kelly of 8973 North 84th Way, Scottsdale, addressed the Commission. He stated that he was a member of the Transportation Commission appointed in 1998 and served as the Chair in 1999 and 2000. He wanted to highlight to the Commissioners the critical importance of the enabling Ordinance.

In regards to the bylaws, Mr. Kelly suggested it might be appropriate to put a reference into the bylaws pertaining to the newly-enacted Code of Ethics, stating that the Commission will comply with the Code of Ethics.

Referring to the first page of section 2-283 of the Ordinance, Mr. Kelly opined that the Commission has a responsibility to implement the Streets Master Plan. If this is the case, it should be mentioned in the Ordinance. Sub-paragraph A to that same section deals with recommending a prioritized five-year Capital Improvement Program for streets to City Council. In his experience, Mr. Kelly noted this a time-consuming task. It might be better to have staff perform the analysis for the Commission to approve.

Mr. Kelly opined that this Ordinance is so important that he would ask the Commission to continue this for further discussion. The street element of the General Plan has been removed and "community mobility element" has been substituted. The Street Master Plan is not addressed. He feels this should be in the Ordinance.

In terms of revising the Ordinance, Mr. Kelly opined that from the Commission's point of view the critical question is: What business are you in? He opined that the Commission's most critical future task will be the implementation of the Transportation Master Plan over a 20-year period. The Ordinance gives the Commission the authority to do its work. If the Commissioners feel they need authority to be able to work with the Planning Commission that should be included in the enabling Ordinance.

Mr. Kelly noted there is no requirement under the Growing Smarter initiatives to mandate inter-city cooperation and collaboration.

Commissioner Taunton queried staff about Mr. Kelly's comments regarding the Streets Master Plan, asking whether the Transportation Master Plan superseded it. Mr. Meinhart confirmed that is correct.

Commissioner Howard noted it was his understanding that the Code of Ethics binds members of all boards and commissions, and opined that adding a reference to the bylaws would be redundant. He asked whether there is something else the Commission can do that has not been addressed. Mr. Meinhart replied he is not an expert on the ethics policy, but it was his understanding that it was to cover boards and commissions.

Commissioner Howard needs to know more about this. He had thought the Commissioners would undergo the ethics training and be bound by the Code of Ethics adopted recently by City Council. Mr. Meinhart reiterated he is not an ethics expert and opined that if they wished, the Commission could add language to the effect that the Commission will comply with all ethics codes and guidelines developed by the City Council. Chairman Gilliland noted that the City Attorney reviewed the Commission's bylaws and had not mentioned adding ethics to the bylaws.

Commissioner Hill said that City Council has made the decision to adopt the Code of Ethics recently and that if reference to it needs to be added to the bylaws, this should come from City management and apply to all boards and commissions. He opined that both the draft bylaws and the recommended changes to the Ordinance might need a little work.

Chairman Gilliland read Commissioner McCall's comments, the first of which was, "On paragraph 202 'Or, as may be scheduled by a majority of the members at any previous meeting,' do not make sense to me, seem to be redundant to the preceding instances of or of a majority of its members?"

Her second comment deals with paragraph 303. "We could eliminate the second occurrence of 'of the Commission.'"

Commissioner McCall's next comment deals with 201, 202, and 402, that "They do not say anything about weekends and holidays being excepted in the 24- to 48-hour window. The Open Meeting Law does not mention anything about this."

Her final comment deals with Roberts Rules. She wrote, "I would like to see this paragraph changed to: 'When any question of parliamentary procedure arises, Roberts Rules of Parliamentary Procedure should be used as a guide, with the Chair making the ultimate decision of how the meeting shall be conducted.'"

Commissioner Taunton commented he would approve the bylaws as stated, with the addition of Commissioner McCall's final comment about Roberts Rules of Parliamentary Procedure.

COMMISSIONER TAUNTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE BYLAWS AS STATED, WITH THE ADDITION OF COMMISSIONER MCCALL'S COMMENTS ON THE MEETING BEING RUN EITHER ACCORDING TO ROBERTS RULES OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE OR AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIR. COMMISSIONER HILL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO ZERO (0).

Mr. Meinhart introduced a discussion of revisions to the Ordinance governing the activities of the Transportation Commission. Responding to an earlier question from Commissioner Hill, he clarified that the phrase "transportation element" is now officially replaced by "community mobility element" in the General Plan.

The proposals are to update the language to the terminology currently in use. The "Streets Master Plan" is now changed to the "Transportation Master Plan." Some historical references that no longer apply have been deleted.

Referring to Mr. Kelly's comments about the CIP review, Mr. Meinhart stated that he has worked on this for a number of years and believes the process that has been developed is useful, but not overwhelming, to the Commission.

Referring to Mr. Kelly's comments about development coordination, the initial paragraph is the entrée that the Department uses to be actively involved and provide input in the review of development cases. The Department's traffic engineers manage a Traffic Impact Mitigation program using consultants to review potential traffic impacts. Those recommendations are made to City Council.

Mr. Kelly's comment regarding regional review of the impacts of projects is correct. Mr. Meinhart noted he was actively involved in this in Florida, but noted that without legislation he did not see that as within the City's purview at this time.

Chairman Gilliland inquired whether Commissioner McCall's suggestion to change "complaints" to "comments" has been incorporated into the current version. Mr. Meinhart confirmed that staff had made that change.

Commissioner Hill thanked Mr. Kelly for his comments and his continued observation of City governance. He is inclined to wait a month and digest Mr. Kelly's comments about the Ordinance. He does not agree that language defining the authority of the Commission is necessary, since the Commission makes recommendations to City Council. A revision to the Ordinance merits reflection. He believes it is within the purview of the Commission to evaluate, examine and make recommendations on the operating budget as well as the capital improvement budget to City Council, noting that this is not mentioned in the Ordinance. Commissioner Hill wondered why this should be so.

Mr. Meinhart replied that to the best of his understanding, when the Commission was initiated, the focus was almost entirely on capital improvements. The operating budget was for personnel, training, and travel, and the City Manager makes recommendations to City Council on these items. Today, a

portion of the sales tax money is going to operations in the form of transit service and transit service improvements. Staff routinely brings these matters before the Commission, but Mr. Meinhart noted that maybe they need to look at clarifying this in the Ordinance.

Commissioner Hill stated that the Commission needs to be aware of operating budgets and make recommendations where appropriate. They should have an understanding of operating costs in order to make recommendations about capital improvements. He feels that the Ordinance needs more work before it is revised.

Commissioner Taunton found the current proposed changes acceptable, but is prepared for further discussion at a later meeting if other Commissioners agree.

Commissioner Howard commented how delightful it is to hear from a past Chairman of the Commission. It was helpful to hear Mr. Kelly's remarks about the lessons he learned while serving on the Commission. He concurred with Commissioner Hill's comments that the Commission should continue to analyze the Capital Improvement Program. Commissioner Howard recalled Mr. Meinhart's informative explanation of the CIP when he was a new Commissioner.

Commissioner Howard noted that inter-city coordination is important. He suggested that absent a State law, it still might be helpful to hold meetings with their counterparts in adjacent cities.

With regard to the planning and zoning matrix, Commissioner Howard noted that in his experience, planners tend to think in terms of development rather than infrastructure. Transportation is becoming an issue that will affect the development potential of parts of the City. It would make sense to devote some attention to the gray area between the Planning Commission and the Transportation Commission.

Commissioner Howard expressed concern that the Transportation Master Plan will be cast in concrete and become unalterable. In his opinion, one of the rules that should guide the Commission's thinking is not only the question of implementation of the Master Plan, but also recognition that the Master Plan will evolve over time as the City evolves. He regards the Commission as the guardians of the Transportation Master Plan, to ensure that it has a continuing life and is not static.

In response to a query from Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Meinhart confirmed that the Streets Master Plan would cease to exist as a standalone document. There will be a streets element in the Transportation Master Plan as well as a transit element, bicycle element, and pedestrian element. Items such as intelligent transportation and safety will be addressed throughout the document. Staff prefers one document to simplify prioritizing. He agreed with Commissioner Howard that adjustments are likely to be needed over the 20-year lifespan of the Transportation Master Plan.

Chairman Gilliland noted that the Ordinance sets out the duties and limits of involvement for the Transportation Commission. He asked staff if the Commission were to ask for involvement in the operating budget as has been suggested tonight, whether City Council can approve the Ordinance, or whether there are further steps in the approval process.

Mr. Meinhart replied that ordinances are adopted by City Council. He suggested that the Commission might want to focus on transit. He reminded the meeting that the Transportation Department does not maintain the streets. This is a function of the Municipal Services Department. Landscaping and median maintenance is done by the Community Services Department.

Chairman Gilliland summarized that the Commission is not ready to take action on this item tonight. He stated that he is in agreement with Commissioner McCall's comment to substitute "comment" for the word "complaint," and directed staff to make that change.

He also directed staff to add an additional item asking for the operational information to accompany information about capital improvement projects. The Commission will discuss the Ordinance further at a later meeting.

Commissioner Hill opined that if there are not adequate operating funds in the City budget to maintain the transportation system, this becomes a Transportation Commission concern, no matter which department is responsible for maintenance. The language in the Ordinance dealing with this could be worded as a non-restrictive addendum, inviting and allowing the Transportation Commission to look into the operating budgets that support the transportation system. Mr. Meinhart undertook that staff will work on language to that effect.

Commissioner Howard commented that the issues of coordination outside the City of Scottsdale, and the role of the Commission in being the keeper of the Master Plan fit into paragraphs (e) and (c) of the existing document. Understanding how decisions are made consistent with the infrastructure and development needs of the community requires some other paragraph. By the next meeting, he noted that he would like to see some thoughts on that.

Mr. Meinhart suggested that the Commission may want to consider having some dialogue on this topic in the joint meeting with the Planning Commission. Recommendations on language might result from that discussion. Commissioner Howard commented that he would like to go into the joint meeting with an initial draft in hand. Mr. Meinhart replied that staff can assist in drafting language.

7. **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

None.

8. **IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Chairman Gilliland noted that at the next meeting staff could provide a Transportation Master Plan update, Neighborhood Traffic Management program update, and could possibly take action on the proposed modifications to the ordinance.

Chairman Gilliland reported he received a comment from Commissioner McCall, noting that she is interested in hearing about the recent developments with the Ethics Task Force.

Commissioner Taunton asked for a brief presentation regarding transit improvements, perhaps after the start of the next fiscal year. Mr. Meinhart replied that nothing has changed substantially since the most recent staff presentation a few months ago. However staff can provide the background in the next packet. If the Commission wishes, staff can then make a presentation at the July meeting.

Chairman Gilliland noted that he hopes that general project updates will be an agenda item for the next meeting. He would also like information regarding the second public comment period added at the end of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

***NOTE: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO RECORDINGS OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR UP TO SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING THE MEETING DATE.**

IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, THE SUMMARIZED MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTS. ONLY THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DISCUSSION APPEARING WITH QUOTATION MARKS ARE VERBATIM.

SUBMITTED BY:

A/V Tronics

Officially approved by the Transportation Commission on June 15, 2006